

Question Number	RFP Page	Section	Question/Request For Clarification	Answer
1	78	4.23	<i>During the bidder's conference, Randy Miller stated that the incumbent by contract must release its staff to other companies. Please clarify where this exists in the incumbent's contract? We believe the clause in the current contract language referred to by Mr. Miller is similar to RFP Requirement 4.23: "If the State determines that it would be in the State's best interest to hire an employee of the Contractor, the Contractor will release the selected employee from any non-compete agreements that may be in effect." This clause does not specify that the Contractor must release staff to other competing companies or to release them from a non-compete agreement. Please clarify.</i>	<p><i>Section 20.310 of the current fiscal agent contract statement of work states:</i></p> <p><i>"The Contractor will not restrict or prevent Contractor staff from accepting employment with any successor Contractor. The State will work with the incumbent and successor contractors on the timing of any transition of incumbent staff."</i></p>
2		Addendum 1	<i>On Addendum 1 to the RFP, the State extended the due date of the RFP to February 2nd. We appreciate this extension. However, in order to deliver a comprehensive and appropriate response, it is our belief that vendors will need more time to review the materials, understand your requirements and adjust their response based on answers to submitted questions and potential amendments. Will the State grant an extension for the RFP response to March 15th or as near that date as is possible consistent with the State's constraints?</i>	<i>The State revised the due date for proposals to 3:00 p.m. on Friday, February 2, 2007. The State will issue answers to questions as soon as they are completed. Answers will be posted on the State procurement website and updated as additional groups of questions have been answered.</i>
3			<i>There are conflicting areas in the RFP in regards to the mandatory aspects of the contract. Per the Bidder's Conference discussion, please clarify which contract terms are mandatory, if any. Is the State willing to consider additions or modifications to the contract, such as limitations of liability,</i>	<i>Under Section 3.3.4 of the RFP, bidders should pose questions about the state boilerplate clauses or suggest alternative language to the boilerplate. Based on the state's response, bidders may choose to include suggested language within their proposals under the terms</i>

			<i>consequential damages, liquidated damages for Federal Financial Participation, and indemnification clauses?</i>	<i>of the RFP Section 2.7. However, bidders should understand that the state considers all terms issued under the state boilerplate mandatory and should be prepared to accept all such terms as the state may not accept any requested changes during final contract negotiation.</i>
4			<i>Many states hold confidential discussions with vendors as part of the procurement process. These discussions are usually two to four hours in length and help the vendor understand the State's goals, criteria and requirements, as well as providing the opportunity to discuss proposal options that may increase the value to the state in terms of cost and/or quality of the solution. Thus, confidential discussions with vendors early in the procurement process can help increase the quality of the submission and the value to the State. Proposed topics for discussion may include alternative approaches to meeting the state's needs by focusing on business outcomes rather than a staffing oriented solution, clarification of technical solution requirements, transition approach options, performance optimization ideas, confirmation of business goals and approaches for future changes to the MMIS system . Is the state able and willing to hold confidential discussions with vendors as part of the RFP procurement process?</i>	<i>The State will not hold confidential discussions with vendors.</i>
5		General	What impact, if any, does the State expect the new eligibility contract with IBM to have on the contract resulting from this procurement? For example, interface, business rule, or process changes.	The State is not anticipating major interface, business rule, or process changes as a result of the modernization project.
6		General	Per the bidder's conference, please confirm the "State review and approval" of all deliverables will be 10	The State is willing to consider an alternate review and approval schedule based on adequate

			days. Would the State consider a five-day approval of all deliverables during the Implementation Phase?	notification prior to deliverable delivery, the number, size, and timing of the deliverables.
7		General	Does the State anticipate continuing to use LBMS and OMNI in this contract? Claims, Finance, and Provider appear to have LBMS deeply embedded in their processing. If yes, how many resources does the State anticipate are needed to support the large LBMS system?	The winning bidder will be expected to maintain IndianaAIM and supporting systems “as is” and allocate sufficient staff to support these systems.
8		General	Please confirm that, per the bidder's conference, the State does not intend to procure or have bid as part of this contract a new system, and that alternate proposals are not allowed. Our understanding is that you are simply seeking value add in the context of the RFP requirements provided to ensure your ability to evaluate all proposals equitably.	The purpose for the RFP can be found in Section One, General Information, 1.3, which reads as follows: “The purpose of this RFP is to select a Contractor that can satisfy the State’s need for takeover and operation of the Indiana MMIS and provision of Fiscal Agent services as defined in Section 5, Scope of Work. It is the intent of FSSA OMPP to contract with a Respondent that provides quality MMIS operation and Fiscal Agent services for FSSA OMPP.”
9	25	3.1	The last row in the 3.1 table (tab 5g) references Section 3.15. The RFP does not include Section 3.15. Please clarify where the bidder can find the Evidence of Financial Responsibility form	The row referenced in Table 3.1 is deleted. Bids do not need to include Tab 5g.
10	32 101	3.4.1.6 5.1.4.3	Please clarify whether the “systems manager” referred to in 3.4.1.6 and the “systems director” referred to in 5.1.4.3 are the same position	The positions are the same position. The State intends for this position to be the “Systems Director”.
11	39	3.5	Please specify where the bidder should include the price for Takeover in the Price Schedules. Also, is this price going to be part of the total overall scoring on price?	The contractor awarded this project will be reimbursed up to \$5 million for takeover. This cost is not to be included in the price schedules and is not included in the overall scoring on

				price.
12	44 to 53	3.5.11 through 3.5.20	Please confirm that postage will be required as part of “other” costs in the cost sheets. If not, please indicate how the contractor should handle postage costs.	Postage costs will be reimbursed separately to the contractor. They are not to be included in the pricing schedules.
13	60	4.4.3	Please confirm that the threshold for TPL includes recovery and avoidance.	The threshold for TPL includes recovery and avoidance.
14	61	4.4.5	Please confirm that the State expects the contractor to attain the services of an Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) firm and include it in the proposal. Also, please confirm that the State is not expecting the price for the IV&V services to be included in the bidder’s cost proposal	The contractor will obtain the services of an IV&V firm after contract award, in consultation with the State. This is not to be included in the proposal and the cost of this is not to be included in the proposal.
15	60	4.4.4	Please confirm that the change in fee-for-service population percentage would be adjusted for increase and decrease.	The requirement is written based upon the State’s intent.
16	66	4.13	Per the bidders conference, please confirm that the business knowledge relating to all new or modified Federal standards, conditions, or functional requirements for the operation of the MMIS and fiscal agent responsibilities is required as part of this contract. Additionally, please confirm that the business definition, requirements gathering, and systems modifications/operations requirements and implementation of such would be handled through the modifications pool.	The Contractor is responsible under maintenance and its base price to modify the system for known changes identified in the RFP, such as implementation imaging for Provider Enrollment. The Contractor is also responsible under maintenance and its base price to meet the requirements in the RFP. The modification dollars referenced in the RFP are allocated to pay for system enhancements based on State and Federal direction, policy, rule, and statute. Business and operations expertise for system enhancements is also the responsibility of the Contractor and is included in its base price.
17	74	4.20.12.1	Please confirm that 4.20.12.1 relates to the system capacity to process claims within 24 hours of receipt, not the operational ability to enter claims into the	“Receipt” as referenced in 4.20.12.1 refers to receipt of the claim data into the claims processing system.

			<p>system.</p> <p>Please confirm that the State's expectation is for the Contractor to pay, deny, or suspend the claim within 24 hours of the AIM system receiving the claim.</p> <p>Also, please confirm this relates only to paper claims once they are entered into the AIM system.</p>	
18	116	5.1.6.61	Per the bidder's conference, please confirm the State intends for bidders to include pricing for the SAS-70 audit as part of the proposal. What other audits need to be priced?	SAS-70 is the specific audit requested.
19	164	5.6.4.54	Does the 1 percent refer to fee-for service members only, or does the State intend for the bidder to cost for mailing MRNs to managed care members as well?	Fee for Services member only
20			Will IN FSSA extend the deadline to respond to this opportunity by 10 weeks, approximately March 30, 2007 or after? While we appreciate IN FSSA's extension of the proposal deadline to February 2, 2007, there are approximately five (5) MMIS FAS/DDI RFP's in the same time frame as the IN FSSA MMIS opportunity, with three (3) states preceding the IN FSSA RFP release and requiring end of January/first of February proposal submission dates.	The State revised the due date for proposals to 3:00 p.m. on Friday, February 2, 2007. The State will issue answers to questions as soon as they are completed. Answers will be posted on the State procurement website and updated as additional groups of questions have been answered.
21			<p>What is the status of the EDS Contract? What is the current end date of the EDS contract?</p> <p>There is confusion as to the reasons for the "fast track" proposal response date.</p>	EDS' contract with the State of Indiana ends December 31, 2007.
22	31	3.4.1.4	Please clarify where Bidder's can locate the instructions and forms for corporate references mentioned in Requirement 3.4.1.4.	The reference forms and instructions can be found in the procurement library.

23	43-53	3.5.10 to 3.5.20 (Pricing Schedules)	Please confirm whether postage expenses will be pass-through costs, which are reimbursed to the vendor (as under the present MMIS contract).	Postage costs will be reimbursed separately to the contractor. They are not to be included in the pricing schedules.
24	103 150	5.1.4.6 5.4.4.25	<p>Please clarify which is the correct requirement for the EPSDT coordinator. Requirement 5.1.4.6 states an associate's degree. Yet, 5.4.4.25 states a bachelor's degree.</p> <p>Will the State allow four years of Indiana Medicaid experience to be substituted in lieu of a bachelor's degree with a minimum of an associate's degree as a requirement?</p>	<p>The requirement of 5.1.4.6 which states an associate's degree is in error. The degree requirement of 5.4.4.25 of a bachelor's degree is correct. The bidder may propose filling key positions with staff that have alternative, equivalent education and experience qualifications. The bidder may substitute health care insurance or Medicaid experience in another state for Indiana Medicaid experience. If alternative qualifications are proposed, the bidder should indicate the justification and explain the equivalency. Any such alternatives will not cause the proposal to be rejected for failure to meet mandatory requirements, but will be evaluated accordingly. The State also reserves the right to specifically enforce the requirements of the RFP for any or all positions. After each year of operation, the Contractor may submit a proposed staffing plan for subsequent years, subject to approval by the State.</p>
25	103	5.1.4.6	<p>Please confirm that all 21 key staff are to be named and resumes included in the response.</p> <p>It is in the contractor's experience in several states, that Medicaid systems and program experience for the below positions proves to be a critical factor in ensuring successful operations.</p> <p>Will the state accept a minimum of equivalent years</p>	<p>The bidder must submit resumes and reference sheets for the following key staff positions; project manager, deputy project manager, chief financial officer, operations manager, and systems director. The bidder must submit a plan for filling the other key staff positions within the proposal. The specific numbers of required employees and the named key staff positions</p>

			<p>of Medicaid experience in lieu of the degree for certain key personnel positions, such as:</p> <p>Systems Director – 8 years of Indiana Medicaid experience</p> <p>Deputy Project Manager – 16 years of Medicaid experience</p> <p>Operations Manager – 16 years of Medicaid experience</p>	<p>specified in the RFP are mandatory. The Contractor must additionally maintain sufficient staff in all categories necessary to meet the requirements and performance standards of the RFP. The bidder may propose filling key positions with staff that have alternative, equivalent education and experience qualifications. The bidder may substitute health care insurance or Medicaid experience in another state for Indiana Medicaid experience. If alternative qualifications are proposed, the bidder should indicate the justification and explain the equivalency. Any such alternatives will not cause the proposal to be rejected for failure to meet mandatory requirements, but will be evaluated accordingly. The State also reserves the right to specifically enforce the requirements of the RFP for any or all positions. After each year of operation, the Contractor may submit a proposed staffing plan for subsequent years, subject to approval by the State.</p>
--	--	--	--	---